

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OFFICIAL

32692

Customer Number

AUG 16 2004


Patent  
Case No.: 57255US002

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor: CLARK, JOHN C.  
Application No.: 09/997081 Group Art Unit: 1753  
Filed: November 28, 2001 Examiner: Kishor Mayekar  
Title: ELECTROPHORETICALLY DEPOSITED HYDROPHILIC COATINGS FOR FUEL  
CELL DIFFUSER/CURRENT COLLECTOR

REPLY UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
To Fax No.: 703-872-9306	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on:	
August 16, 2004	
Date	Signed by: Philip Dahl

Dear Sir:

This Reply follows the Office Action dated April 16, 2004, in the above-identified application.

Under the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.136(a), Applicant petitions to extend the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application. The requested extension and appropriate fee are as follows (check time period desired):

- ☒ 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(1) - Extension within first month  
☐ 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(2) - Extension within second month  
☐ 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(3) - Extension within third month  
☐ 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(4) - Extension within fourth month.

Please charge any fees due, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

09/01/2004 DFLOYD 00000001 133723 09997081

01 FC:1251 110.00 DA

Application No.: 09/997081

Case No.: 57255US002

Bett nowhere teaches a process of electrophoretic deposition, and is therefore inapposite to the present claims. In addition, the reference nowhere teaches the use of a carbon fiber construction, as recited in all of the rejected claims. Furthermore, Bett nowhere teaches the use of  $ZrO_2$ , as recited in claim 6, and nowhere teaches a hydrophilic carbon fiber construction capable of wicking 200mg or 250mg of water per 40mg, as recited in claims 10 and 11 respectively.

Illston likewise fails to teach the use of a carbon fiber construction, as recited in all of the rejected claims. Also like Bett, Illston nowhere teaches the use of  $ZrO_2$ , as recited in claim 6, and nowhere teaches a hydrophilic carbon fiber construction capable of wicking 200mg or 250mg of water per 40mg, as recited in claims 10 and 11 respectively.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the rejections of claims 1-11 under 35 USC § 103(a) have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

August 16, 2004

Date

By: Philip Y. Dahl, Reg. No.: 36,115  
Telephone No.: (651) 737-4029Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833